

## Stations of the Cross

REV. EDWARD P. KILGALEN

**T**HERE is one devotion to which these days of Lent are especially consecrated—a devotion so characteristically suited to the spirit of this time that it has become the outlet of the public and private devotion of the Church and her children. Several times a week we meet here publicly to follow in spirit the foot-steps of Jesus Christ, from the steps of Pilate's palace to the tomb. Private devotion, too, prompts us during this season to make the Stations of the Cross our chief form of prayer. In order that we may assist with more piety and love on this holy pilgrimage, that we may better realize the august meaning of every step on that blood-marked path, we shall recall to our minds a few thoughts which will help us in that journey.

First of all, the devotion of the Way of the Cross has not just recently sprung up in the Church. It had its place at least in the hearts of Mary and the few faithful disciples even before that first Pentecost day on which the Church formally began her ministry. Mary was the first certainly to revisit the scenes of the passion. These were the last places that His feet had sanctified; these were the spots reddened by the last drops of His blood; here too, she listened to the last words He addressed to her. Mother-like, she clung to these memories painful as they were, and she lived again the scenes of that terrible journey, because suffering was the means of bringing her closest to her Divine Son.

Doubtless John, to whom our Saviour had confided her, was her constant companion and his heart too bled again as he traversed the pathway of his Lord. We can imagine them standing beneath the balcony of Pilate and seeing again the face of Jesus as the Roman Emperor bade the Jewish people to "behold their King." The terrible cries of greeting which the Jews sent up to that command still ring in their ears, and heart-sick, they turn away to make again that sorrowful journey to Calvary. It was not difficult for them to follow the path which He had trod. Every scene of that journey was stamped indelibly in their memories, but even were this not so, they could

have known the way especially in the first days after the Passion, by the stream of blood that marked the streets and roadways of Jerusalem, as if in answer to that blasphemy of Jerusalem's children, that His blood, the blood of the gentle Nazarene—be upon them and upon their children. Gradually too the Apostles inspired the early Christians with a love for the scenes of the passion. It was too dangerous in the beginning for crowds to be seen making these Stations of the Cross. However, after peace had come to the Church, every Christian community over the civilized world was devoted to the passion of Christ; and today throughout the whole world, art and money and sculpture have been made use of to their fullest extent to render vivid and life-like these fourteen scenes in the passion of our Lord.

As we begin these Stations, each one of which is a tale of terrible suffering, we should call to our minds the dispositions and feelings with which Jesus began them. He had gone up into the Garden of Olives with His three chosen disciples to make His last act of resignation to the will of His Eternal Father. As they mounted the slopes of Olives, the setting sun was bathing in gold the marble courts of Pilate's palace and the gilded roofs of the Temple. Music and the sounds of gladness came to their ears across the quiet valley from the mansion of Herod. All else was peaceful and serene. But the soul of Christ was torn with anguish. Man's sins and the abandonment of the Father bore down upon Him with crushing weight. He turned to his three Apostles and said: "My soul is sorrowful even unto death." Many times before, Christ had spent the whole night in prayer upon this mountain, but this was His last trial. He felt the separation from the Father. No longer was He the Beloved Son, but now he was the exile upon whose head the sins of the whole world were laid. He turned to His human friends for comradeship, but they were heavy with sleep. Alone, he prayed for strength. His was a perfect manhood and, as a man, He felt bitterly the anguish of the Passion; His humanity cried out against that load of suffering which was to begin soon with the kiss of a false friend. His human will quailed at the terribleness of it all, but He was doing now that role which had been decreed upon by

the Holy Trinity from all eternity—"Not my will but Thine be done." At the foot of the tabernacle we begin our Way of the Cross, and we know that tabernacle is the repository of that same Divine blood which poured in sweat from the Body of Christ in the garden. It has been miraculously preserved for us, by His own word, and before. It we make our acts of preparation just as Christ in Gethsemani made His last act of resignation. If we bring this thought before our minds, it will not be hard to excite ourselves to pity and love for Him who, as our elder Brother, takes upon Himself the punishment that should have been ours.

The Traitor has come! His treacherous kiss has signed the death warrant of Christ and in bonds He makes His way to the trial rooms of Herod and Pilate. These two princes, one the representative of the Jewish people, the other the representative of Roman power, were enemies, but because they each one sent Jesus back and forth from one to the other in the garb of a fool and neither was man enough to protect His innocence, they were made friends that night. Pilate let the Jews be His judges and they condemned Him to death. He had cured their ailments; He had raised their dead to life; they had tried to crown Him King, but now He is worthy of death. No voice was raised in His defense—not even the voices of those who had received that gift of speech through Him. Pilate trembled for his position and he tried to wash off from his hands and heart the heinous injustice which he had done.

The cross is waiting for Christ. The Jews had planned this means of execution, not only because it was considered the most ignominious death that was possible, but it was their belief, that God even cursed the one who died on a cross. Their law read: "Cursed is he that hangeth on a tree." We realize the blessing of that curse. It has been our salvation, our fountain of life, the means of all our graces, the hope of our eternal happiness.

Out into the streets of Jerusalem He goes with the sign of His death upon His shoulders. Amid the jeers of the crowd He meekly follows His executioners. The day of miracles is at an end. He does not use that power to protect Himself—no, that was for others. Behold the Man. How transfigured! The Divinity is hidden in the human.

The blood from His temples blinds Him as He stumbles along; every nerve of a delicately wrought body tingles with acutest pain; every movement tears His flesh still more. Is it any wonder that He falls three times to the ground?

Imagine Mary's feelings as she meets Him on this journey. She knew the decree that was against Him; she knew that her child was of His own will an outcast and despised. She knew that He was to end it all upon the cross, but I feel, my friends, that her wish must have been that the Father would allow this anguish to be shortened. He passed along and the look upon his Mother's face would haunt the last stages of His journey.

Tradition tells us that Simon the Cyrenian refused to help Jesus to carry the cross until he was forced to do so. We feel that our hearts would have been moved to pity, that we would have done anything to relieve His sufferings. So said St. Peter and all the Apostles, but they deserted Him when the test came. Besides, Simon was a stranger in Jerusalem and perhaps he had never known the loving kindness of the Nazarene. We know well all that Christ has done for us. This knowledge came to us as a first rich treasure from Catholic parents, but still we will not give up some pet sin, and sin weighted down the shoulders of Christ more than did the cross. We will not make some slight sacrifice to please Him and still sacrifice and the cross are the same.

Only two kindnesses were shown Christ as He went along. The saintly woman, Veronica, offered Him a towel with which to dry the blood from off His face and the women offered Him a tribute of pity by their tears. Could man ever realize, did he not know the fact, that he could pity and compassionate the God who made him? Are our hearts compassionate as we follow the Way of the Cross? Christ appreciated these acts of mercy, He left the image of His face upon the towel of Veronica and the plenitude of His grace in her heart. He will do the same for us if we tell Him that we are made sorrowful by His sufferings. He will imprint in our hearts the image of His countenance, not a mere representation but a living force that will vivify our consciences and make it harder to leave His presence by sin. The blood from that Divine countenance will animate our souls, and when we come to the judgment

seat of God, the sight of our imperfections and small sins will fade into insignificance as the Man-God looks upon the image of His own face. Every word of pity and love which we address to Jesus as we make the Stations of the Cross, will be as bread thrown upon the running waters, it will come back to us in that last day when we need help most.

Each step brings Jesus nearer to Calvary. Mary follows Him and sees that life which she gave Him slowly ebbing away. At last He is upon the summit and He lays His tired, aching Body upon the cross. The echo of the piercing nails has died away and the cross is raised between earth and heaven. For three hours more the breath of life remains in the Body of Jesus. No tongue can tell the anguish of those last three hours. During this time when even the slightest movement of His lips intensifies the strain and suffering, He gives mercy and pardon to the thief, forgiveness to His enemies, protection to His Mother and His soul into the hands of God.

The thorn crowned head of Christ drops upon His shoulders and the Man-God is dead. The stigma of the human race is wiped out and man has come back to his inheritance. Christ had said "If I shall be lifted up I will draw all things unto myself." Prophecy has become fact, for the magnetic influence of the cross has made itself felt through all centuries and it is the reason of our gathering here today.

With Mary and the two disciples we tenderly lift Jesus from the cross. We carry Him in awful reverence to the tomb of our own hearts. That first Good Friday night, the dead Body of Jesus depended for its burial upon the generosity of one man. Now, each one of us has offered Him the sepulchre of a loving heart. We cannot leave Him alone any more; our hearts ache for the touch of His presence. We followed Him from the halls of Pilate to the mountain of Calvary, but there we took Him down from the cross no more to be separated from Him, because for Thee, oh, Christ, is our love and with Thee is our strength and our salvation.

## Religious Statistics of the World

**T**HE Rev. Dr. John Aufhauser, Professor of Missionary Science at the University of Munich, Germany, has made a tour of the missionary countries of the world. Dr. Aufhauser left Germany in October, 1923, and visited Italy, Egypt, the Sudan, India, the Straits Settlements, Singapore, China, Japan and the Philippine Islands. In the United States he attended the convention of the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade at Notre Dame, Ind. The statistics presented by him in the accompanying article represent the most comprehensive and up-to-date figures available.

The population of the world is now estimated at 1,646,-491,000. Classified according to the different religions there are a total of 564,510,000 Christians, (34.6% of the grand total population). The chief subdivisions of the Christians are the following:

Catholics, 272,860,000 (16.5%).

Protestants, 171,650,000 (10.4%).

Oriental-Orthodox, 120,000,000 (7.7%).

There are 1,081,981,000 non-Christians (65.8%).

The chief subdivisions of the non-Christians are the following:

Confucianists and Taoists, 300,830,000 (18.2%).

Mohammedans, 221,825,000 (13.5%).

Hindus, 210,540,000 (8.3%).

Animists, 158,000,000 (9.6%).

(Animists are such as believe in a soul and spiritual beings).

Buddhists, 138,031,000 (8.4%).

Shintoists, 25,000,000 (1.7%).

Jews, 12,205,000 (0.7%).

Others of no religion, 15,280,000 (0.9%).

Another census estimates the population of the world at 1,713,000,000; 683,000,000 Christians, 305,000,000 Catholics, 220,000,000 Protestants, 158,000,000 Oriental-Orthodox, and 1,030,000,000 non-Christians, 500,000,000 Buddhists, 230,000,000 Mohammedans, 200,000,000 Hindus, 100,000,000 Animists.

For the Far East the religious division is the following:

*British-India*—The census of March 15, 1921, estimates

the total population of India (without Ceylon and Burma) at 305,773,381. The majority, 216,249,436, are Hindus; 68,234,641 Musselmans; 9,072,074 Animists; 3,233,960 Sikhs; 1,174,461 Jains; 369,325 Buddhists; 101,380 Parsis; 4,496,976 Christians (14.65%); 2,889,184 Catholics; 1,472,448 Protestants; 248,000 St. Thomas Christians (Syrian-Christians); 20,643 Jews; 15,980 others.

*Ceylon*—The same census gives the population as 4,504,549. Buddhism is the prevailing religion with 2,570,000 adherents; 982,000 are Hindus; 303,000 Mohammedans; 443,000 Christians (8.4%); 369,132 Catholics; 42,300 Protestants.

*Burma*—The census of 1921 gave the total population as 13,169,099. The vast majority of the inhabitants, 11,201,043 are Buddhists; 702,587 Animists; 500,592 Mohammedans; 485,150 Hindus; 4,843 Sikhs; 1,135 Jains; 380 Parisis; 1,135 Jews; 257,103 Christians (19.69%); 91,882 Catholics; 160,000 Protestants; others, 14,231.

*Siam*—The estimated population is 9,221,000 (census of 1911-12, 8,266,408). Buddhism, the prevailing religion, in 1918-19, had 13,616 temples and 87,538 priests. There are 1,000,000 Musselmans; 47,000 (5.21%), Christians; 24,393 Catholics; 22,000 Protestants.

*Indo-China*—The population is 19,747,431. A majority of the people are Confucianists and Animists. There are 1,100,000 (65.42%) Christians; 1,077,034 Catholics; 9,500 Protestants.

*Dutch East India*—According to the census of 1920 the approximate total population is 49,350,834. The bulk of the natives are: Mohammedans, 35,080,000; 789,000 are Animists; 436,000 Buddhists; 170,000 Hindus; the Christians number 754,000 (15.89%); 102,299 Catholics; 650,000 Protestants.

*Philippine Islands*—At the time of the census of December 31, 1918, the total population was 10,314,310. The predominant religion is the Catholic with 7,790,937 adherents. The independent Filipino Church, founded in 1901 by Gregorio Aglipay, has 1,417,448 followers, according to the same census. Protestants number 2,124,375; Christians of all denominations number 9,381,357 (93.6%). There are 508,596 Animists; 24,263 Buddhists; 443,037 Mohammedans; others, 5,454.



*China*—The population (excluding Tibet, Mongolia and Manchuria) is estimated at 318,653,000; other statistics give 436,094,953 or 443,382,000. Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism are the three dominant religions. Most Chinese profess and practise all three together; therefore it is impossible to give an accurate or estimated number of the adherents of each of them. Thirty millions are Mohammedans; 2,800,000 (0.82%) are Christians; 2,075,040 Catholics; 806,926 Protestants; 5,700 Orthodox-Christians.

*Korea*—There are 17,264,119 inhabitants. The majority are Confucianists. In 1920 there were estimated to be also 1,407 Buddhist temples with 7,913 priests. There are 186,000 (1.069%) Christians; 89,541 Catholics; 96,092 Protestants.

*Japan*—The Country of the Rising Sun numbers 56,745,400 inhabitants. The chief forms of religion are Shintoism with thirteen sects (in 1919 there were numbered 49,459 large and 66,738 minor shrines and 14,698 priests or ministers), and Buddhism, including all sects (1919) counted 71,625 large and 36,086 minor temples; 52,894 priests and priestesses. Two hundred and fifteen thousand (0.376%) are Christians; 80,975 Catholics; 99,647 Protestants; 34,782 Russian-Orthodoxes. (The majority of Japanese are Shinto-Buddhists).

In all these countries, excepting only Siam, there is no State religion, and absolute religious freedom prevails. In Siam, Buddhism is the State religion. In Japan, Buddhism as a State religion has been abolished since 1868. Shinto was subsequently installed as the only State religion. But in 1884 both were disestablished. The Constitution of November, 1889, guarantees freedom of belief (Art. 28). The Shinto, the religion of the reigning dynasty and the court, is today the national official cult of Japan. Certain temples are maintained out of public moneys and the attendance of certain officials is required from time to time at ceremonies of a semi-religious, semi-court nature.

In China, Confucianism has not been recognized as a State religion since the revolution (Nov. 1911), but it is today the oasis of ethical teaching in national education. In 1912 and 1917 the Constitutional Conference refused a proposal to make Confucianism the State religion of China.



Christian missions of all different denominations have full liberty in all these countries, especially in China. There are numerous Christian mission schools, colleges, high schools and normal schools for boys and girls, as well as "universities" in India, China and Korea. The governmental schools in all these countries exclude all religious instruction. Only an ethical instruction is given. Japan particularly, where elementary education is compulsory, forbids, since 1899, religious teaching in all kinds of schools. One reason for this attitude is the undoubted suspicion that loyalty to the throne may be undermined and nationalism endangered by Christian teaching.

### Catholics in the United States

THE Catholic population of the United States, according to the "Official Catholic Directory" for 1923, totals 18,260,793. The hierarchy consists of 17 archbishops (two being cardinals) and 94 bishops. There are 16,459 diocesan and 6,086 regular priests; 11,228 churches; 5,834 mission stations; 108 seminaries with 8,778 students; 236 colleges for boys; 723 academies for girls; 6,406 parish schools with 1,922,430 pupils; 312 orphan asylums with 47,971 inmates and 118 homes for the aged.

An exhaustive study of the increase in the Catholic population in the United States, made in a pamphlet by the Most Rev. J. F. Regis Canevin, Titular Archbishop of Pelusium and former Bishop of Pittsburgh, contains the estimate that the Catholic population in the United States in 1922 was 22,733,254, and denies that there have been the serious defections from the Church, particularly among the foreign born and their descendants that have been asserted by some recent writers on this subject.

The figure, given as the Catholic population in 1922 is considerably in excess of the number given in the "Catholic Directory" for the same year. This divergence the Archbishop explains as follows:

"The foregoing calculation places the whole number of Catholics to be accounted for at the end of 1922 at 22,733,254, which is 4,625,640 more than 18,107,614, the

figures given for the Catholic population of the United States by the "Catholic Directory" (1922). This discrepancy does not mean that 4,625,640 are to be counted lost to the Church. In the 22,733,640 are contained about 3,337,000 Italians, including their children, and 1,500,000 more made up of the late immigrants from France, Belgium, Cuba, Mexico, Portugal and their descendants, of whom not fifty per cent would be included in the usual parish census of practising and contributing Catholics from which the statistics of the Directory are compiled. Yet nearly all of this eclipsed tenth are as Catholic today as the same class of people in the countries of their ancestors."

The Archbishop presents a statistical survey of the growth of the Catholic population from 40,000, which he estimates as the total, in 1790, down to the present day. Figures showing the natural increase and the increase from immigration, together with the totals are given for each ten-year periods from 1820 to 1920. The Catholic increase by immigration for each of the periods is found by adding to the Catholic population the same percentage of the total increase in the foreign-born population as will represent the proportion of Catholics in the countries from which the immigrants came.

#### LOSSES AMONG IMMIGRANTS

Concerning current allegations of great losses to the Church among immigrants and their children the Archbishop writes:

"In setting the question of increase and progress we must bear in mind the vast numbers of baptized but uneducated and unbelieving men and women who land upon our shores from countries in which the Catholic religion is supposed to prevail. Let us always ask: in what relation to the Catholic Church did the immigrants stand in their own country? What percentage of them were really Catholics, as we count Catholics, before they left their native land? Was it sixty per cent or even less? Why then should it be said that the other forty or fifty per cent have been lost to the faith after they landed on our shores?

"It must also be kept in mind that not all Catholic immigrants remain with us. Government statistics show that large numbers of immigrants die within ten years after

their arrival and that, in each decade, for the past fifty years the number of foreigners who left the country was forty per cent or over of the number that arrived in that decade. This shows that many persons are counted as immigrants more than once, because they come to our shores and return to their native land several times.

"To estimate correctly the number of foreign-born Catholics that must be accounted for, we must calculate, not the number of Catholic immigrants within a given period but the number who survived and were living in this country at the end of that period, according to the census reports showing the number of foreign-born persons living in the United States at the end of each decade; not the immigrants who remain and leave, but the immigrants who remain in the United States and increase our foreign-born population."

#### DECREASE IN BIRTHS

Citing government figures to show that the increase of the population by births alone has dropped from 35.86 per cent for the ten-year period ending in 1850 to 14.09 per cent for the ten-year period ending in 1920, the author comments as follows:

"The steady and rapid fall in the rate of natural increase of the population of the United States during the past fifty years, shows that race suicide, divorce, decrease of marriages, and late marriages are doing deadly work outside the Catholic body. Only immigration, which in each decade since 1860 has supplied from thirteen to fifteen per cent of the total population, and the high Catholic birth rate, have kept our natural increase above the low level of dwindling France in the last thirty years. During that period, Catholics have not altogether escaped the unchristian influences of their environment especially in the decrease of marriages and custom of late marriages. Their increase has been retarded also by the small proportion of women among Catholic immigrants, but despite all these hindrances there has been a high excess of births over deaths in the Catholic population."

As to the role of conversions in offsetting what losses there may have been, Archbishop Canevin writes:

"We do not know how many have been gained to the Church in the last one hundred years by conversion, but

the gain has been great, greater than in any country in Europe. Some parishes are largely composed of converts and the descendants of converts. I am loath to believe that our losses have been greater than our gains, especially when we consider that while less than one hundred years ago Catholics were only one in fifty of the population, they are now one in five."

---

### **The British Empire's Catholic Statistics**

**T**HE Catholics of the British Empire total 14,439,941, according to the "Catholic Directory" for 1923, an increase of 253,630 on the previous year's figures given by the same authority.

The total for the United States and the British American Possessions is 29,015,774 (an increase of 1,829,164 on the total for 1922), which, with the figures for the British Empire, makes a grand total of 43,455,715 Catholics in English-speaking countries.

Archbishops and bishops in England and Wales number 21; priests, secular and regular, 3,935; churches, chapels, and stations, 1,948.

Archbishops and bishops in Scotland number 7; priests, secular and regular, 601; churches, chapels and stations, 425.

The Catholic population of England and Wales (estimated in 1921) was 1,965,787, an increase of 33,796 on the previous year's total; that of Scotland (estimated in 1920), 601,304.

The Catholics of Ireland (indicated by the Government returns for 1911 out of a total population of 4,390,219) number 3,242,670, with 3,828 priests.

Conversions in the various dioceses of England and Wales in 1921 reached the grand total of 11,621. Westminster Archdiocese heads the list with 1,837. Liverpool Archdiocese comes next with 1,638, and the Diocese of Salford shows 1,422.

The average Catholic increase by conversions alone in any one year may be set down roughly at 10,000. In some years this average is exceeded; but ten thousand may be taken as the general average of conversions alone. In the last statistical year the baptisms of children in the Catholic

Church totalled some 73,322. So that the total number of souls added to the Church in the last statistical year was 84,743.

The Anglican Church professes to be the Church of the nation; it is commonly supposed, on account of its alleged numerical superiority, to represent the religious opinion of the nation. But the day cannot now be far off when, if numbers are of any account, the Catholic Church will be the dominant single religious confession of England and Wales.

Tabulated returns of the religious affiliations of the people of Canada, obtained from reports of the Dominion census of June, 1921, and issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce, follow:

Catholics 3,388,663; Presbyterians, 1,408,812; Methodists, 1,158,744; Anglicans, 1,047,959; Baptists, 421,730; Lutherans, 287,484.

Included in Canada's total population of 8,788,483 a year ago last June, were 125,190 Jews, 13,826 Christian Scientists, 11,626 Buddhists and 19,956 Mormons.

The "Catholic Directory" for Australasia for 1923 gives the Catholics in Australia as 1,017,641, about one-fifth of the total population; in New Zealand 152,008, out of a total population of more than 1,218,270; in the Missions of Oceanica 80,000. There are 1,854 churches in Australia with only 1,390 priests, religious and secular, and in New Zealand 361 churches with only 262 priests. In the Catholic Schools of Australia are 164,102 children. In New Zealand, 20,718. Australia has 4 ecclesiastical seminaries, all in Sydney; New Zealand 1, in the diocese Dunedin. Australia has 201 boarding schools for girls and 50 colleges for boys; New Zealand, 21 girls' boarding schools and 5 boys' colleges.

### **St. Luke's Witness to St. Peter**

REV. VINCENT McNABB, O.P.

*Reprinted from "Blackfriars"*

**I**T is a little disconcerting that Catholic apologetics and Biblical exegesis, on the whole, have not yet grasped the full value of the organic treatment of the Gospels, especially in the matter of the Petrine privilege. Apologists

and Biblical exegetes still largely appraise the gospel data by what may almost be called "a show of hands." We have no wish to discourage this method of valuation; which, indeed, is often demanded by the literary character of the exegesis. But if there is a higher and truer method it will be found that "the best is the foe of the good."

Let us exemplify this by studying some of the lesser ways in which the Gospel of St. Luke witnesses to the primacy of St. Peter. We will pass over the classical passage (Luke xxii, 25-32) with its clear assertion of St. Peter's power over the other apostles. To the present writer this passage has always seemed to be of even greater importance than St. Matthew's witness, "Thou art Peter," etc. (Matt. xvi, 18-19).

In order to appreciate St. Luke's witness to St. Peter it should be borne in mind and used as an exegetical principle that, roughly speaking, what St. Mark was to St. Peter—that was St. Luke to St. Paul. His devotion to a master who made many demands on his tact and patience seems never to have flagged. It is seen in many details of his two great works, his Gospel of Jesus Christ and his Acts of the Apostles. Even in such a supreme matter as the institution of the Blessed Sacrament he left the tradition of St. Matthew and St. Mark for the tradition of St. Paul.

Critics are not agreed about the exact date of the publication of his Gospel. Yet they are agreed that it is not before but after the circumcision dispute, which at one time had threatened to become a sword of division between St. Peter and St. Paul. Few events in the early life of the Christian Church had borne such a menace of death. It had occasioned St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians with its perplexing statement: "When Cephas was come to Antioch I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed" (Gal. ii, 2). For the moment we may be allowed to contrast this headlongness of St. Paul with the quiet prudence of his "dear physician." St. Paul has no sooner heard of the unrest and changes in his Galatian churches than he pens an epistle which has made even saints to disagree! In contrast with this is the silence of St. Luke, who neither in his Gospel nor in his Acts has the slightest *direct* mention of an event which might have divided the

Church. The Biblical exegete must not merely ignore this incident; he must keep it constantly in mind if his exegesis is to be in touch with reality.

In the copious matter of St. Peter's privileges it is also necessary to deal with the studied omissions of St. Luke. This is all the more necessary because St. Mark's Gospel, being the witness of St. Peter himself, has a genius for minimizing the Petrine claims.

(1) To take a minor point: St. Mark records that "Our Blessed Lord and His disciples came into the house of Simon *and Andrew*" (i, 29). St. Luke quietly omits the reference to Andrew, saying "Jesus . . . went into Simon's house" (Luke iv, 38). To appreciate the significance of these omissions we have to bear in mind that in these passages St. Luke is following the Marcan document almost word for word.

(2) Another point of equal significance may be seen in the following texts relating to the call of the first apostles (Matt. iv, 18): And Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother . . . 19: And He said to *them*: Come ye after Me, and I will make you fishers of men.

Mark i, 16: And passing by the Sea of Galilee He saw Simon and Andrew, his brother . . . 17: And Jesus said to *them*: Come after Me and I will make you to become fishers of men.

Luke v, 10: And so were also James and John, the sons of Zebedee, who were Simon's partners. And Jesus said to *Simon*: Fear thou not, from henceforth *thou* shalt catch men.

It is to be noticed that St. Matthew and St. Mark give the commission in the plural. I will make you (to become) fishers of men. St. Luke, in accordance with what we can only call his principle, omits the plural and gives the charge in the singular to Peter alone.

(3) Had we only the Gospel of St. Matthew it would be impossible to be sure that the name *Peter* had been given to Simon by Jesus Himself. The giving of the name is so significant that we ask our readers to consider the following texts:

Matt. x, 2: And the names of the twelve apostles are these: the first Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother . . .



Mark iii, 14: And He made that twelve should be with Him . . . 16: And to Simon He gave the name Peter. 17: And James, the son of Zebedee, and John, the brother of James, and He named them Boanerges.

Luke vi, 13: He called unto Him His disciples; and He chose twelve of them, whom also he named apostles. 14: Simon, whom he surnamed Peter, and Andrew, his brother, James and John . . .

(a) St. Matthew does not give any additional name except that of "Simon, who is called Peter." There is no mention of the Sons of Thunder, Boanerges. But St. Matthew does not explicitly say that the name Peter was given by Jesus.

(b) St. Mark gives the phrase "To Simon he gave the name Peter." Yet St. Peter, with his usual self-effacement, almost obliterates this privilege by suggesting that a kindred privilege was given to James and John, whom "He named Boanerges."

(c) But St. Luke, in his concern for the primacy of St. Peter, does two things. Firstly, he omits the giving of the names to James and John. Secondly (as one of the disciples?), he records how Jesus chose from the group of disciples a group of twelve, to whom He gave a special name—Apostles—in token of their special office over the disciples. Moreover, even as Jesus chose and named the twelve apostles from the group of disciples so did He choose and name one—Simon—from the group of apostles in token of his special office over the rest of the apostles.

(4) A still more striking point is St. Luke's treatment of St. Peter's profession of faith.

Matt. xxvi, 16: Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.

Mark viii, 29: Peter, answering, said to Him: Thou art the Christ.

Luke ix, 20: Simon Peter, answering, said: The Christ of God.

All three witnesses are of equal value. But the next incident is full of significance.

Matt. xvi, 21: Jesus began to show to His disciples that He must . . . suffer many things . . . and be put to death . . . 22: And Peter, taking Him, began

to rebuke Him . . . 23: Who, turning, said to Peter: Go behind Me, Satan.

Mark viii, 31: And He began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer . . . and be killed . . .

32: And Peter, taking Him, began to rebuke Him . . .

33: Who, turning about and seeing His disciples, threatened Peter, saying: Go behind Me, Satan.

Luke ix, 22: The Son of man must suffer many things . . . and be killed. . . .

There is no mention of St. Peter's rebuke of Jesus! There is no mention of Jesus calling St. Peter Satan! This is all the more significant because all three writers add the sentence: "If any man will follow Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." In Matt. and Mark the words of our Lord are naturally part of His rebuke to St. Peter. But St. Luke suppresses the context which gives them appositeness: and his suppression is due to his desire not to quote words which seemed to lessen the honor due to St. Peter.

Still further significance is given to the suppression by the fact that what St. Luke withholds from St. Peter he gives to Judas. St. Matthew and St. Mark had both recorded our Blessed Lord's words calling St. Peter Satan. It remained for St. Luke, who had suppressed this incident, to apply it with redoubled force to Judas. St. Luke says (xx, 3): "*And Satan entered into Judas.*" Moreover, St. Luke is determined to disabuse the early Christians of any exaggerated view of Satan's power over St. Peter. He quickly adds the words of our Lord: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (31, 32). As Satan's power has entered into Judas, so has Jesus' power entered into Peter! St. Luke, the faithful companion of St. Paul, could hardly give greater force to his acknowledgment of the primacy of St. Peter.

St. Luke's action seems to have had influence over St. John. The word "Satan" is only once mentioned in St. John's Gospel, where it is almost a word-for-word borrowing from St. Luke.

Luke xxii, 3: And Satan entered into Judas.

Jo. xiii, 27: Satan entered into him.

Both St. Luke and St. John make it quite clear to the early Christians which of the apostles was the follower of Satan, which the follower of Jesus Christ!

(5) A minor point of some significance is found in the account of the Transfiguration.

Mark ix, 4: Peter, answering, said to Jesus: Rabbi, it is good for us to be here . . . 5: For he knew not what he said . . . 6: And there was a cloud overshadowing them, and a voice came out of the cloud saying: This is my beloved Son. Hear ye Him.

Luke ix, 33: Peter said to Jesus: Master, it is good for us to be here . . . not knowing what he said . . . 34: *And as he spoke these things* there came a cloud and overshadowed them . . . 35: And a voice came out of the cloud: This is my beloved Son. Hear Him. St. Luke makes it appear that it was whilst St. Peter was uttering words revealed by God the divine cloud overshadowed the group of apostles.

(6) A study of St. Luke's account of the denial of St. Peter is of importance. We must contrast it with St. Mark.

The Boast. Mark xiv, 27: And Jesus saith to them: You will all be scandalized in My regard this night . . . 29: But Peter saith to Him: Although all shall be scandalized in thee, yet not I.

Luke xxii, 32: But I have prayed for thee (Simon) that thy faith fail not . . . 33: Who said to Him: Lord, I am ready to go with thee both into prison and to death.

St. Luke has contrived to take away much of the empty boasting of St. Peter. St. Mark had represented St. Peter *denying the clear* prophesy of our Lord. St. Luke entirely suppresses this prophesy, making St. Peter's boast follow not unnaturally on his Master's promise of supernatural help.

Again St. Luke entirely suppresses St. Peter's proud comparison with the other apostles.

The Prophesy of St. Peter's Denial. Mark xiv, 30: . . . Amen I say to thee; today, even in this night before the cock crow *twice*, thou shalt deny Me thrice. 31: But he spoke the more vehemently: Although I should die together with thee I will not deny thee.

Luke xxii, 34: I say to thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day till thou thrice deniest that thou knowest Me.

It will be seen that St. Luke's form of prophesy has softened the form of St. Peter's denial. There is no warning cock-crow to increase the deliberateness of the fault.

Moreover, St. Mark records that St. Peter's boast was repeated for the second time and after the second prophesy of his denial. St. Luke characteristically leaves this out!

The Denial. Mark xiv, 68: He denied saying: I neither know nor understand what thou sayest . . . And the cock crew . . . 70: And he denied again . . . 71: And he began to curse and to swear, saying: I know not this man of whom you speak . . . 72: And immediately the cock crew again . . . And he began to weep bitterly.

Luke xxii, 57: He denied Him, saying: Woman, I know Him not . . . 58: And after a little while another, seeing him, said: Thou also art one of them. But Peter said: I am not . . . 60: And Peter said: Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately as he was yet speaking the cock crew . . . 62: And Peter, going out, wept bitterly.

Here as elsewhere every slight change or omission made by St. Luke tends to lessen the grievousness of St. Peter's fall. St. Luke most dramatically omits all mention of St. Peter cursing and swearing.

St. John again follows St. Luke in softening an incident which might lessen the respect due to St. Peter. Our Blessed Lord's prophesy was fulfilled to the letter. But St. Luke omits the first warning cock-crow!

(7) A further confirmation of St. Luke's concern for the dignity of St. Peter is to be found in the account of the Agony in the Garden.

Mark xiv, 37: And He cometh and findeth *them* sleeping. And he saith to Peter: Simon, sleepest *thou*? Couldst not *thou* watch one hour? 38: Watch *ye*.

Matt. xxvi, 40: And He cometh to His disciples and findeth them asleep. And He saith to Peter: What? Could *you* not watch one hour with me? 41: Watch *ye*.

Luke xxii, 45: And when He rose up from prayer and was come to His disciples He found them sleeping for

sorrow. 46: And He said to them: Why sleep you? Arise, pray lest you enter into temptation.

Again we see the concern of St. Luke to safeguard the dignity of St. Peter. St. Matthew had already softened the extreme self-accusation of St. Mark's (*i. e.*, St. Peter's) Gospel by changing the singular number into the plural. In this way a reproach which seemed levelled directly against St. Peter was turned against the little group of the three chosen apostles. But St. Luke is not content with St. Matthew's efforts to screen St. Peter. He entirely omits all mention of St. Peter!

(8) The last minor point is so continuous with all the preceding and so valuable in itself that it forms a fitting close.

Luke xxiv, 12: But Peter, rising up, ran to the sepulchre, and, stooping down, he saw the linen cloths laid by themselves . . . 33: And, rising up the same hour, they (*i. e.*, the two disciples) went back to Jerusalem; and they found the eleven gathered together, and those that were with them . . . 34: Saying: The Lord is risen indeed and has appeared to Simon. This fact constitutes a unique corroboration of the Primacy of St. Peter.

To judge of St. Luke's witness we should do well to forget for a moment that it is the work of a contemporary. If we found that it belonged, say, to the early fourth century, and especially if we found that the oldest codices were nowhere to be found in the East, but only in the West, how much would be rightly made of these definite Petrine leanings. Critics would soon agree that it was a definitely Papal document, written with as evident a theological purpose as the Fourth Gospel. It would be urged most accurately that the Petrine matter is not casual—that it is deliberately included—that there is such a Petrine prepossession that *in no case* does he allow a Marcan reference to St. Peter to go unsoftened.

But if the Gospel of St. Luke is what tradition takes it to be—not the work of the fourth or even of the second century, written by a supporter of Papal Rome—but the work of the first century, written by the faithful follower of St. Paul, critical principles cannot be abandoned merely because they add a new corroboration of the divinely given powers of St. Peter.